SUBJECT No. 16.

Amendment of Section 8 (1) of the Village Offices Regulation.

Messrs. K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality; and S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Nagar Sabha.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Establishment of Village Panchayet and Village Munsiffs' Courts.

(1) Messrs. Agali Venkatramaiya and Ugre Gowda, Sira Taluk; Hutchire Gowda, Gubbi Taluk; Madappa, Mysore Taluk; and Chiksubba Rao, Hunsur Taluk.
(2) Messrs. K. Shamiengar and Nadig Bheema Rao, Channagiri Taluk.
(3) Mr. Shama Udupa, Nagar Taluk.
(4) Mr. S. Ramanna, Hassan Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—(1) The Village Panchayet Regulation and the scheme of Village Munsiffs' Courts may be introduced at least in one or two places as an experimental measure.

(2) This subject has been repeatedly urged but no action has yet been taken. To facilitate the disposal of petty disputes, it is prayed that Village Panchayet Courts may be established.

(3) To facilitate the formation of Village Panchayet Courts, it is proposed that four or five villages may be grouped together and that a Panchayet consisting of respectable persons may be formed to decide disputes involving small amounts. This will obviate the necessity of going to law courts at considerable expense and encourage thrift among the ryots.

(4) Petty disputes of a civil nature are increasing in villages. Poor people cannot afford to go to civil courts. It would be better if Village Panchayets are organised for each village or for a group of two or three villages to dispose of disputes involving sums not exceeding Rs. 50. It is prayed that Government may pass a law to this effect.

*Reply of Government.*—The draft bill is under consideration.

The Dewan then desired the members to state whether in their opinion evidence should be recorded in the trial of cases before the village courts. The members replied that the procedure followed in summary trials by criminal courts might be adopted.

SUBJECT No. 18.

Introduction of the Mamlatdar's Act.

(1) Mr. Lingappa, Harihar Sub-Taluk.
(2) Messrs. Madappa and Sidde Gowda, Mysore Taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—(1) Amildars may be empowered to settle petty disputes between lessors and lessees of lands. By this measure great relief will be given to the public as their time and money will be saved. Only contested and important cases will go to civil courts. This Act is in force in the Bombay Presidency.

(2) The Bombay Mamlatdars Act may be introduced to enable Amildars to decide on the spot disputes as to encroachment, etc.

*Reply of Government.*—A committee will be appointed to investigate and advise as to the desirability of legislation on this subject.

SUBJECT No. 19.

Amendment of the Municipal Regulation.

Mr. M. C. Rangaiengar, Mysore City Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—(1) Section 68 of the Municipal Regulation may be amended so as to show clearly the owner's liability for taxes. In the case of building leases granted by private persons the lessor may be made primarily responsible for the payment of the amount due.

(2) Also Section 82 of the Regulation may be amended so that the bill may be regarded as notice.

(3) A clause may be added in the Municipal Regulation so as to enable a municipality to recover from a person resident within its limits municipal taxes due to another municipality.

(4) The Regulation may be so amended as to make it possible for a person who has paid the tax on an animal or vehicle for a certain period in one municipality to be exempt from again paying the tax for the same animal or vehicle for the abovesaid period, if the person should remove to another municipality during that period.

(1) Mr. M. C. Rangiengar stated that the Regulation did not clearly explain the liability of house owners in respect of municipal taxes.

Asked whether there was any objection to recover taxes summarily, Messrs. Karnik Krishnamurti Rao and V. Raghavachar expressed themselves in favour of recovering such taxes as if they were land revenue; but Mr. Rangiengar said that he would reserve his opinion on the point as it required some consideration.

(2) Mr. Rangiengar said that the procedure laid down in Section 82 of the Municipal Regulation led to unnecessary delay in the recovery of municipal taxes as, in addition to the presentation of the bill, the service of notice had also been presented. There was no object in requiring this additional formality as the bill was in reality also a notice. He therefore requested that the section may be suitably amended.

(3) As regards representation (3) it was pointed out to Mr. Rangiengar that such cases as were referred to by him were very few and that the analogy of similar procedure in regard to the recovery of land revenue due in one taluk by the authorities of another did not apply, as different municipalities had no sort of inter-relation with one another.